REPORT OF THE AUDIT OF THE FORMER FLEMING COUNTY SHERIFF

For The Year Ended December 31, 2006



CRIT LUALLEN AUDITOR OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

www.auditor.ky.gov

105 SEA HERO ROAD, SUITE 2 FRANKFORT, KY 40601-5404 TELEPHONE (502) 573-0050 FACSIMILE (502) 573-0067

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

AUDIT EXAMINATION OF THE FORMER FLEMING COUNTY SHERIFF

For The Year Ended December 31, 2006

The Auditor of Public Accounts has completed the former Fleming County Sheriff's audit for the year ended December 31, 2006. Based upon the audit work performed, the financial statement presents fairly, in all material respects, the revenues, expenditures, and excess fees in conformity with the regulatory basis of accounting.

Financial Condition:

Excess fees decreased by \$7,950 from the prior year, resulting in excess fees of \$4,165 as of December 31, 2006. Revenues decreased by \$110,948 from the prior year and expenditures decreased by \$102,998.

Report Comment:

• The Former Sheriff's Office Lacked Adequate Segregation Of Duties

Deposits:

The former Sheriff's deposits were insured and collateralized by bank securities.

<u>CONTENTS</u> PAGE

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT	1
STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND EXCESS FEES - REGULATORY BASIS	3
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENT	6
REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING AND ON COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS BASED ON AN AUDIT OF THE FINANCIAL	
STATEMENT PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS	11
COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATION	15



The Honorable Larry Foxworthy, Fleming County Judge/Executive Honorable Jerry Wagner, Former Fleming County Sheriff Honorable Scotty Royse, Fleming County Sheriff Members of the Fleming County Fiscal Court

Independent Auditor's Report

We have audited the accompanying statement of revenues, expenditures, and excess fees regulatory basis of the former Sheriff of Fleming County, Kentucky, for the year ended December 31, 2006. This financial statement is the responsibility of the former Sheriff. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on this financial statement based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Audit Guide for County Fee Officials issued by the Auditor of Public Accounts, Commonwealth of Kentucky. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statement is free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statement. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

As described in Note 1, the Sheriff's office prepares the financial statement on a regulatory basis of accounting that demonstrates compliance with the laws of Kentucky, which is a comprehensive basis of accounting other than accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

In our opinion the financial statement referred to above presents fairly, in all material respects, the revenues, expenditures, and excess fees of the former Sheriff for the year ended December 31, 2006, in conformity with the regulatory basis of accounting described in Note 1.

In accordance with <u>Government Auditing Standards</u>, we have also issued our report dated March 19, 2007 on our consideration of the former Sheriff's internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements and other matters. The purpose of that report is to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over financial reporting and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the internal control over financial reporting or on compliance. That report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with <u>Government Auditing</u> Standards and should be considered in assessing the results of our audit.



The Honorable Larry Foxworthy, Fleming County Judge/Executive Honorable Jerry Wagner, Former Fleming County Sheriff Honorable Scotty Royse, Fleming County Sheriff Members of the Fleming County Fiscal Court

Based on the results of our audit, we have presented the accompanying comment and recommendation, included herein, which discusses the following report comment:

• The Former Sheriff's Office Lacked Adequate Segregation Of Duties

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Sheriff and Fiscal Court of Fleming County, Kentucky, and the Commonwealth of Kentucky and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these interested parties.

Respectfully submitted,

Crit Luallen

Auditor of Public Accounts

March 19, 2007

FLEMING COUNTY JERRY WAGNER, FORMER SHERIFF STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND EXCESS FEES - REGULATORY BASIS

For The Year Ended December 31, 2006

Revenues

Federal Grants			\$ 15,730
State - Kentucky Law Enforcement Foundation Program Fund (KLEFPF)			26,207
Board Of Education			13,929
State Fees For Services: Finance and Administration Cabinet	\$	10,022	
Cabinet For Human Resources	Ψ ——	875	10,897
Circuit Court Clerk:			
Sheriff Security Service		5,951	
Fines and Fees Collected		2,750	
Court Ordered Payments		941	9,642
Fiscal Court			111,724
County Clerk - Delinquent Taxes			1,162
Commission On Taxes Collected			142,952
Fees Collected For Services:			
Auto Inspections		4,895	
Accident and Police Reports		202	
Serving Papers		17,545	
Carrying Concealed Deadly Weapon Permits		4,910	
Add-on Fees		17,680	
Drug Forfeiture		16,552	
HB 452		1,690	
Miscellaneous		164	63,638
Interest Earned			745
Borrowed Money:			
State Advancement			 176,300
Total Revenues			 572,926

FLEMING COUNTY

JERRY WAGNER, FORMER SHERIFF

STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND EXCESS FEES - REGULATORY BASIS For The Year Ended December 31, 2006 (Continued)

Expenditures

Operating Expenditures and Capital Outlay:		
Personnel Services-		
Deputies' Salaries	\$ 197,351	
Other Salaries - KLEFPF	22,951	
Employee Benefits-		
Employer's Share Social Security	3,130	
Workers' Compensation and Unemployment	2,739	
Employer's Share Hazardous Duty Retirement	17,118	
Employer Paid Health Insurance	2,467	
Contracted Services-		
Advertising	68	
Communications	6,408	
Vehicle Maintenance and Repairs	7,850	
Materials and Supplies-		
Office Materials and Supplies	2,373	
Uniforms	1,951	
Auto Expense-		
Gasoline	23,919	
Other Charges-		
Conventions and Travel	8,429	
Fiscal Court Fees	9,395	
Postage	4,176	
Jury Meals	193	
Carrying Concealed Deadly Weapon Permits	3,140	
Miscellaneous	1,243	
Capital Outlay-		
Office Equipment	4,417	
Vehicles	 500	\$ 319,818
Debt Service:		
State Advancement		176,300
		 /
Total Expenditures		 496,118

FLEMING COUNTY

JERRY WAGNER, FORMER SHERIFF

STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND EXCESS FEES - REGULATORY BASIS For The Year Ended December 31, 2006

(Continued)

Net Revenues	\$ 76,808
Less: Statutory Maximum	 69,341
Excess Fees	7,467
Less: Training Incentive Benefit	 3,302
Excess Fees Due County for 2006	4,165
Payment to Fiscal Court - March 19, 2007	4,165
Balance Due Fiscal Court at Completion of Audit	\$ 0

FLEMING COUNTY NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENT

December 31, 2006

Note 1. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

A. Fund Accounting

A fee official uses a fund to report on the results of operations. A fund is a separate accounting entity with a self-balancing set of accounts. Fund accounting is designed to demonstrate legal compliance and to aid financial management by segregating transactions related to certain government functions or activities.

A fee official uses a fund for fees to account for activities for which the government desires periodic determination of the excess of revenues over expenditures to facilitate management control, accountability, and compliance with laws.

B. Basis of Accounting

KRS 64.820 directs the fiscal court to collect any amount, including excess fees, due from the Sheriff as determined by the audit. KRS 134.310 requires the Sheriff to settle excess fees with the fiscal court at the time he files his final settlement with the fiscal court.

The financial statement has been prepared on a regulatory basis of accounting, which demonstrates compliance with the laws of Kentucky and is a comprehensive basis of accounting other than accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. Under this regulatory basis of accounting revenues and expenditures are generally recognized when cash is received or disbursed with the exception of accrual of the following items (not all-inclusive) at December 31 that may be included in the excess fees calculation:

- Interest receivable
- Collection on accounts due from others for 2006 services
- Reimbursements for 2006 activities
- Tax commissions due from December tax collections
- Payments due other governmental entities for payroll
- Payments due vendors for goods or services provided in 2006

The measurement focus of a fee official is upon excess fees. Remittance of excess fees is due to the County Treasurer in the subsequent year.

C. Cash and Investments

At the direction of the fiscal court, KRS 66.480 authorizes the Sheriff's office to invest in the following, including but not limited to, obligations of the United States and of its agencies and instrumentalities, obligations and contracts for future delivery or purchase of obligations backed by the full faith and credit of the United States, obligations of any corporation of the United States government, bonds or certificates of indebtedness of this state, and certificates of deposit issued by or other interest-bearing accounts of any bank or savings and loan institution which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) or which are collateralized, to the extent uninsured, by any obligation permitted by KRS 41.240(4).

FLEMING COUNTY NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENT December 31, 2006 (Continued)

Note 2. Employee Retirement System

The county officials and employees have elected to participate in the County Employees Retirement System (CERS), pursuant to KRS 78.530 administered by the Board of Trustees of the Kentucky Retirement Systems. This is a cost-sharing, multiple-employer defined benefit pension plan that covers all eligible full-time employees and provides for retirement, disability, and death benefits to plan members.

Benefit contributions and provisions are established by statute. Non-hazardous covered employees are required to contribute 5 percent of their salary to the plan. The county's contribution rate for non-hazardous employees was 10.98 percent for the first six months and 13.19 percent for the last six months of the year. Hazardous covered employees are required to contribute 8.0 percent of their salary to the plan. The county's contribution rate for hazardous employees was 25.01 percent for the first six months and 28.21 percent for the last six months of the year.

Benefits fully vest on reaching 5 years of service for non-hazardous employees. Aspects of benefits for non-hazardous employees include retirement after 27 years of service or age 65. Aspects of benefits for hazardous employees include retirement after 20 years of service or age 55.

Historical trend information pertaining to CERS' progress in accumulating sufficient assets to pay benefits when due is presented in the Kentucky Retirement Systems' annual financial report which is a matter of public record. This report may be obtained by writing the Kentucky Retirement Systems, 1260 Louisville Road, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601-6124, or by telephone at (502) 564-4646.

Note 3. Deposits

The former Sheriff maintained deposits of public funds with depository institutions insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) as required by KRS 66.480(1)(d). According to KRS 41.240(4), the depository institution should pledge or provide sufficient collateral which, together with FDIC insurance, equals or exceeds the amount of public funds on deposit at all times. In order to be valid against the FDIC in the event of failure or insolvency of the depository institution, this pledge or provision of collateral should be evidenced by an agreement between the former Sheriff and the depository institution, signed by both parties, that is (a) in writing, (b) approved by the board of directors of the depository institution or its loan committee, which approval must be reflected in the minutes of the board or committee, and (c) an official record of the depository institution.

Custodial Credit Risk - Deposits

Custodial credit risk is the risk that in the event of a depository institution failure, the former Sheriff's deposits may not be returned. The former Sheriff did not have a deposit policy for custodial credit risk but rather followed the requirements of KRS 41.240(4). As of December 31, 2006, all deposits were covered by FDIC insurance or a properly executed collateral security agreement.

FLEMING COUNTY NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENT December 31, 2006 (Continued)

Note 4. Drug Forfeiture Account

The former Sheriff's Office maintained an account for the purpose of receiving assets forfeited to the Commonwealth of Kentucky as a result of legal proceedings. Expenditures from this account are to be used for direct law enforcement. The balance at January 1, 2006 was \$16,660. The drug forfeiture account earned \$75 in interest and expended \$16,552 in allowable expenditures, leaving a \$183 balance as of December 31, 2006.

Notes 5. COPS In School Grant

The former Sheriff's office was awarded a COPS In School Grant from the United States Department of Justice in the amount of \$89,507 in 2003. Funds totaling \$73,777 were expended in prior years. The Fiscal Court received \$15,730 as a reimbursement for allowable payroll expenditures, expending all grant funding.

REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING AND ON COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS BASED ON AN AUDIT OF THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS



The Honorable Larry Foxworthy, Fleming County Judge/Executive Honorable Jerry Wagner, Former Fleming County Sheriff Honorable Scotty Royse, Fleming County Sheriff Members of the Fleming County Fiscal Court

Report On Internal Control Over Financial Reporting And On Compliance And Other Matters Based On An Audit Of The Financial Statement Performed In Accordance With Government Auditing Standards

We have audited the statement of revenues, expenditures, and excess fees - regulatory basis of the former Fleming County Sheriff for the year ended December 31, 2006, and have issued our report thereon dated March 19, 2007. The Former Sheriff's financial statement is prepared in accordance with a basis of accounting other than generally accepted accounting principles. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in <u>Government Auditing Standards</u> issued by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

In planning and performing our audit, we considered the former Fleming County Sheriff's internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinion on the financial statements, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the former Fleming County Sheriff's internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the former Fleming County Sheriff's internal control over financial reporting.

Our consideration of internal control over financial reporting was for the limited purpose described in the preceding paragraph and would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses. However as discussed below, we identified certain deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that we consider to be significant deficiencies.

A control deficiency exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent or detect misstatements on a timely basis. A significant deficiency is a control deficiency, or combination of control deficiencies, that adversely affects the entity's ability to initiate, authorize, record, process, or report financial data reliably in accordance with the regulatory basis of accounting such that there is more than a remote likelihood that a misstatement of the entity's financial statement that is more than inconsequential will not be prevented or detected by the entity's internal control over financial reporting.



Report On Internal Control Over Financial Reporting And On Compliance And Other Matters Based On An Audit Of The Financial Statement Performed In Accordance With Government Auditing Standards (Continued)

We consider the deficiency described in the accompanying comment and recommendation to be a significant deficiency in internal control over financial reporting.

• The Former Sheriff's Office Lacked Adequate Segregation Of Duties

A material weakness is a significant deficiency, or combination of significant deficiencies, that results in more than a remote likelihood that a material misstatement of the financial statement will not be prevented or detected by the entity's internal control. Our consideration of the internal control over financial reporting was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in the internal control that might be significant deficiencies and, accordingly, would not necessarily disclose all significant deficiencies that are also considered to be material weaknesses. However, we do not believe the significant deficiency described above is a material weakness.

Compliance And Other Matters

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the former Fleming County Sheriff's financial statement for the year ended December 31, 2006, is free of material misstatement, we performed tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of financial statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit and, accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under Government Auditing Standards.

The former Sheriff's response to the findings identified in our audit is described in the accompanying comments and recommendations. We did not audit the former Sheriff's response and, accordingly, we express no opinion on it.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of management, the Fleming County Fiscal Court, and the Kentucky Governor's Office for Local Development, and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Respectfully submitted,

Crit Luallen

Auditor of Public Accounts

March 19, 2007



FLEMING COUNTY JERRY WAGNER, FORMER SHERIFF COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATION

For The Year Ended December 31, 2006

INTERNAL CONTROL – SIGNIFICANT DEFICIENCY:

The Former Sheriff's Office Lacked Adequate Segregation Of Duties

The former Sheriff's office lacked adequate segregation of duties. All deputies were allowed to collect receipts. The bookkeeper prepared the daily checkout sheets, reconciled the bank statements to the ledgers, as well as prepared and mailed all checks for expenditures. Another deputy prepared and made bank deposits. The Sheriff reviewed disbursements and signed all checks. Good internal controls dictate the same employee should not handle, record and reconcile receipts and disbursements. The Sheriff should have segregated duties so the same employee did not handle, record, or reconcile receipts and disbursements, or he should have implemented the following steps to strengthen internal controls:

- The former Sheriff should have periodically compared daily bank deposit to daily checkout sheet and then compared the daily checkout sheet to the receipts ledger. Any differences should have been reconciled. He could have documented this by initialing the bank deposit, daily checkout sheet, and receipts ledger.
- The former Sheriff should have reconciled monthly reports to source documents and receipts and disbursements ledgers.
- The former Sheriff should have periodically compared the bank reconciliation to the balance in the checkbook. Any differences should have been reconciled. The former Sheriff could have documented this by initialing the bank reconciliation and the balance in the checkbook.

Former Sheriff's Response: Agree.

PRIOR YEAR:

The Sheriff's Office Lacks Adequate Segregation Of Duties – Repeated